



PACIFIC HANDICAP RACING FLEET OF THE NORTHWEST

P.O. Box 489, Gig Harbor, Washington 98335

Phone: (253) 857-8858 Fax: (425) 962-8729

visit our web site at <http://www.phrf-nw.org>

**Minutes
Handicappers Council Meeting
September 27, 2009**

A handicappers council meeting was held on Sunday September 27, 2009 at the Bellingham Yacht Club, Bellingham WA.

Attendance:

Alan Grim, MIL/None-1 – CH
Neil Bennett, BL
Matthew Wood, CN
Pat Nelson, CNT
Pat Waters, TT
Eric Rimkus, CNP/None-2

Mike Stainsby, PYC
Mike Milburn, SE
Ron Jewula, RVC
Dan Wierman, CNW
David Lynch, PM
Kirk Utter, ST

GENERAL HANDICAPPER COUNCIL BUSINESS

Call to Order/Adoption of Previous Minutes

The meeting was called to order by the Chief Handicapper (CH), Alan Grim, at 1000 hours.

A motion was made to accept the January 25, 2009 minutes. The motion carried.

Administrative Business

Chief Handicapper Remarks:

The CH informed the Council of the issues that arose at Whidbey Island Race Week this year. The Race Organizer, as had been done for many years consecutively, had determined to make changes to the PHRF-NW ratings for some boats. One prominent owner determined that changing PHRF-NW ratings was not acceptable and withdrew from the event as a matter of principle. Some deliberation occurred within PHRF-NW leadership regarding what action we could take. USSailing (Paul Ansfield, USPHRF Chair) was contacted for advice. USSailing urged PHRF-NW to protest under the RRS. No PHRF-NW member was willing to bring a protest. Upon request the Race Organizer made a statement to the competing owners at the event that PHRF-NW was not involved in and did not concur with the rating changes. The Race Organizer agreed that ratings would not be changes in the future. The CH committed the handicappers council to more frequent meetings and rating reviews. Hence, the reason for this meeting.

The CH noted that from 1997-2003, the handicappers council met once per year. From 2004-2007, the council met 4 times each year, mainly to address the change in the rating protocol. Per handicappers council direction, the council met only once in 2008 to give the handicappers a break. The CH had intended and hoped that the regional councils would pick up the slack in reviewing ratings. Although some of the regional councils are active, in general the RCs have not been successful at reviewing and proposing rating changes. Therefore, the CH plans to call three meetings per year, with the primary purpose of conducting handicapper review of ratings.

The CH asked if the Yahoo forum was accessible and usable by all. The attendees all use the forum and find it valuable.

Action: Request the Board of Directors to consider bylaw changes that would allow the handicappers council to operate utilizing electronic methods (virtual meetings via the Yahoo group, electronic voting, etc). The CH will address with the Board.

The CH presented a draft Handicapper Oath to the council for consideration. The purpose is to ensure current and new handicappers are aware of the commitment they accept when volunteering to be their club handicapper. The "Oath" was posted to the Yahoo forum prior to the meeting.

Action: The CH is to revise the Oath per comments received at the meeting, including adding minimum expected computing abilities and resources, and repost to the Yahoo forum for further deliberation.

Handicapper Rating Reviews

HOTF27-1 Rudder Issue:

An appeal was presented to the CH in August that informed PHRF-NW that two boats, Egress and Blackfoot, had removed their stock rudders and replaced them with rudders from Phil's Foils, intended to help with the excessive weather helm experienced by this class of boat. The CH and the responsible handicappers investigated at the time and determined that the rudder change could not increase the performance of the boat by 3 seconds per mile. The decision was to not change the ratings due to the change in rudder. The owners were informed that they are required to report such changes when made to PHRF-NW.

The CH presented the information that was used to make the previous determination to the handicappers council, and gave the council an opportunity to redirect the decision. Upon more detailed review, it was determined that the new rudder although more refined than the original, was within the same planform and did not represent significant enough of a change to warrant a rating change.

The original appeal was considered by the CH as only a report of boats out of configuration, and not an appeal. The appellant was given an opportunity to revise the appeal to substantiate that there was an

observable performance increase. The appellant was not able to produce the revised appeal in time to make the agenda, and the appeal was removed from the agenda. The appellant may bring the appeal to the next handicappers council meeting.

Action: CH to address the lack of Misc code for rudder changes.

The CH handed out a copy of the current roster, sorted by rating, to the handicappers present. The list is a fictional fleet breakdown with the intent of identifying “control” boats. The CH proposed control boats for the handicappers to consider. The idea is to observe performance of the boats rated near the control boat and adjust relative to the control boat.

Action: Handicappers to consider and comment whether the list is useful and which boats make the best choices to “control” the ratings of the fleet.

SIER26/XSIER26:

David Lynch presented data regarding Uno and Dos. Uno is an XSIER26 rated at 60. Dos is a SIER26 rated at 78. Race result analysis suggests UNO would need to be rated 30 seconds slower in order to be competitive. David proposed Uno’s rating be revised 18 seconds slower. Because the boats are located within the Seattle RC, the council directed the SRC to review the ratings of these boats.

Lunch Break (1200 – 1300)

Handicapper Rating Reviews (cont) (1300-1400)

MELG32-1:

PHRF-NW rates at 24, toward the fastest in the US. The boats are dominating the events. Not enough data was available to address. The SRC will address and bring more data to the council.

Action: CH to create a Watch List and place the MELG32-1 on the list.

MELG24-1:

At 99 as-sailed, the MELG24-1 enjoys a relatively high rating when compared to other regions. No further data was provided. Add to the watch list.

1D35-1:

The 1D35 has similar upwind and downwind performance to the COOK12M. 1D35 is rated at 36, COOK12M at 18. The SRC will look at the performance of the 1D35. Add to the watch list.

JBOA125:

At an as-sailed of 6, the boat is very competitive. Rated slower than most regions in the US. SRC to address. Add to watch list.

WIGG37-1, What a Tripp:

Requested add to the watch list. SRC to discuss.

XYAC119:

Requested future review. Responsible Handicapper to document the history of ratings for the different configurations.

Big Boat Fleet Review:

The CH provided a list of the big boat fleet (rating 6 and faster) with the current 2009 ratings, Tom Rutton's proposed ratings and PHRF ratings as reported by USSailing. Also included were ratings of boats that were members in 2008 and 2007, but did not renew for 2009. The discussion centered around selecting the OD48, Flash, as the "control" boat for this fleet and whether the current -25 rating for Flash was equitable. Rutton suggested a rating of -34. USSailing reports high/mean/low of -24/-30/-42. It was agreed that a change to Flash should only occur with commensurate changes throughout the fleet. Further discussion is required.

Member Appeals (1400 – 1500)

JBOA35-1:

Al Whitfield presented the case to revise the J35 rating from its current 73, to 79. The appeal discussed the EXPR37-1/-2, JBOA109-1/-2, JBOA36-1, C&C115-1, BENE36.7-1, and SCHO35-1. The main point of the appellant was that the J35 is an older design that is no longer competitive at the current rating. The CH provided to the council a letter from Brian Watkins, owner of the EXPR37-1 Declaration of Independence, refuting the claims in the J35 appeal. Also present was Kelly Penney, owner of the EXPR37-2 Avalanche. Kelly provided information regarding the differences between the EXPR37-1 and -2. The CH provided the performance factors for these boats, showing that these boats should perform similarly. The handicappers agreed that the JBOA35-1 is the best choice for the "control" boat for this fleet, given the history and large amount of data available. The handicappers also agree that all boats should have a rating that is a multiple of 3.

The following motions were made:

Motion: Revise the rating of the JBOA35-1 from 73 to 75. The Motion Failed.

Motion: Revise the rating of the JBOA35-1 from 73 to 72. The Motion Carried.

Motion: Revise the rating of the EXPR37-1 from 73 to 72. Carried.

Motion: Revise the rating of the SCHO35-1 from 73 to 75. Carried.

Motion: Revise the rating of the JBOA36-1 from 79 to 81. Carried.

Motion: Revised the rating of the BENE36.7-1 from 84 to 78. Carried.

Motion: Revise the rating of the JBOA109-2 from 72 to 66. Failed.

Motion: Revise the rating of the JBOA109-2 from 72 to 69 (base rating changes from 90 to 87). Carried.

Action: Address the JBOA109-1 (one-design config). SRC to address.

Motion: Revise the rating of the C&C115-1 from 75 to 72. Carries.

The meeting adjourned at 1500 hours.

Meeting minutes as recorded by Alan Grim.

AG/ag